

**REMARKS**

This Amendment and Response is made in reply to the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2008, in which the Examiner:

rejected claims 1, 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,307 to Gstöhl et al. ("Gstöhl"); and

rejected claims 5, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gstöhl in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,708,246 to Dunn ("Dunn").

Applicants respectfully address and / or traverse these rejections below. Applicants hereby amend claim 1 and cancel claims 8 and 11, leaving claims 1, 4-5 and 9-10 pending. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5 and 9-10 are presented for consideration in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gstöhl. A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper unless the Examiner establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established unless the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claim recitation. Claims 4 and 9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and include additional recitations thereto.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions.

Gstöhl does not teach or suggest that *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions* as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Gstöhl is directed to a shaft 1 having knurled portions 38 that are shown as continuous around the circumference of the shaft 1. The knurled portions 38, as shown, include alternating ridges and grooves that circumscribe the shaft 1 without interruption (Gstöhl, Figures 13 & 14). Thus, there is no space remaining for *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft to be placed between the knurls and grooves*. In addition, there is no teaching or even remote suggestion in the Specification of an outer circumferential surface being placed between the ridges and grooves of knurled portion 38 in the disclosure of

Gstöhl. If anything, Gstöhl teaches away from *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions* since Gstöhl teaches that the surface of the knurled portions 38 is completely knurled (Gstöhl, Figures 13 & 14). Thus, Gstöhl does not teach or suggest *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions* as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, Gstöhl does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Applicants' claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gstöhl is improper for at least these reasons, and should be withdrawn.

Since claims 4 and 9 depend from claim 1 and include additional recitations thereto, Gstöhl also does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Applicants' claims 4 and 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gstöhl is improper for at least the same reasons, and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gstöhl in view of Dunn. As to the rejections of claims 8 and 11, these claims have been canceled, rendering these rejections moot. Claims 5 and 10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and include additional recitations thereto.

Gstöhl does not teach or suggest that *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions* as recited in amended claim 1, as discussed above.

Dunn does not add to the teachings of Gstöhl, at least in that Dunn also does not teach or suggest that *the outer circumferential surface of the shaft is placed between each pair of knurls and each pair of groove portions* as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Dunn is directed to a shaft B having a smooth outer circumferential surface and a commutator A having a knurled hole for receiving the shaft B. Since shaft B of Dunn has no knurls or grooves provided thereon, shaft B cannot possibly teach or suggest that *the outer circumferential surface of the*

Application No.: 10/546,622  
Final Office Action dated: November 26, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action dated: February 26, 2009

*shaft is placed between said knurls and grooves of the shaft B.* Thus, Dunn does not teach or suggest the *outer circumferential surface* as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, the combination of Gstöhl and Dunn does not teach or suggest the *outer circumferential surface* as recited in amended claim 1. It would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Dunn with the teachings of Gstöhl. For instance, Dunn specifically teaches away from knurling of the shaft B, which Dunn states “represents an additional operation, and presents certain difficulties” (Dunn, col. 1, ll. 63-64). Gstöhl teaches that the surface of the knurled portions 38 is completely knurled (Gstöhl, Figures 13 & 14). Thus, the combination of Gstöhl and Dunn does not teach or suggest the *outer circumferential surface* as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, neither Gstöhl nor Dunn, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every recitation of Applicants' claim 1. Since claims 5 and 10 depend from claim 1 and include additional recitations thereto, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gstöhl in view of Dunn is improper for at least these reasons, and should be withdrawn.

Having addressed and /or traversed each and every objection and rejection, Applicants respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and claims 1, 4-5 and 9-10 be passed to issue.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the current Amendment constitutes new matter. Support for the amendments can be found in, at least, paragraphs [0030] and [0046] as well as Figures 3, 5 and 10.

Application No.: 10/546,622  
Final Office Action dated: November 26, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action dated: February 26, 2009

Applicants believe no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any fees are deemed necessary, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Marina F. Cunningham/  
Marina F. Cunningham  
Registration No. 38,419  
Attorney for the Applicant(s)

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP  
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-3402  
Telephone: (860) 549-5290  
Facsimile: (860) 527-0464